



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/415,052	10/08/1999	RANJIT N. NOTANI	020431.0560	4247

7590 10/28/2003
BAKER & BOTTS LLP
2001 ROSS AVENUE
DALLAS, TX 752012980

EXAMINER

ELISCA, PIERRE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/415,052

Applicant(s)
Ranjit N. Notani

Examiner
Pierre E. Elisca

Art Unit
3621



— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 14, 2003
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-18, and 20-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-18, AND 20-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION
RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment, filed on 08/14/2003.
2. Claims 2-8, 10-18, and 20-44 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-8, 10-18 and 20-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Guck (U.S. Pat. NO. 5,911, 776) in view of Slaughter et al. (U.S. pat. No. 6,421,787).

As per claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, 25-33 and 44 Guck substantially discloses a network that provides a server using an object-database enables an author to create and store an original document, as a source file with a first format (which is sen to read as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated that a system for performing a business process), comprising: a first version of a business application identified using a first version identifier and executable by a first client to perform a business process, the first client being coupled to a second client using a

Art Unit: 3621

communication link, a second version of the business application identified using a second version identifier being executable by the second client to perform the business process (see., abstract, col 4, lines 41-67, col 5, lines 1-7. Applicant should duly note that a first version of a business application is the process of enabling an author to create and store an original document or first document or first application, and the first client and the second client see., fig 1, and also the second version application is the process of updating and retrieve information as files or file-converter and then published in any specific format to multiple numbers of and type of receiving appliances).

It is to be noted that Guck fails to explicitly disclose that if the first version is higher that the second version, to exercise control over execution of the business process, and if the second version is higher that the first version to control the execution of the process (which is readable as if the first user protocol is higher than the second user protocol then exercise control over the business process and vice versa, or the first user who process the first request will have control over the business process). Applicant should duly note that a user with a faster protocol, should have control over the business process.

However, Slaughter discloses a cluster distribution in which each node of the cluster access to each storage device of the cluster using a faster protocol such as Low Latency (see., col 10, lines 8-15). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the format conversion of Guck by including a faster protocol as

Art Unit: 3621

taught by Slaughter because such modification would provide the format conversion of Guck with the enhanced necessary to have a faster network communication or business process.

As per claim 7, Guck discloses the claimed limitations, wherein the first version of the business application further comprises a business process module operable to generate a business message associated with the business process for retrieval by the second client, the business message being generated according to the first version (see., abstract, col 4, lines 41-67, col 5, lines 1-7. Applicant should duly note that a first version of a business application is the process of enabling an author to create, update and store an original document or first document or first application, which is automatically reformatted to match the requirements of the receiver's appliance, and the first client and the second client see., fig 1, and also the second version application is the process of updating and retrieve information as files or file-converter and then published in any specific format to multiple numbers of and type of receiving appliances).

As per claims 15-18, 20-22 and 34-43 Guck substantially discloses a network that provides a server using an object-database enables an author to create and store an original document, as a source file with a first format (which is sen to read as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated that a system for performing a business process), comprising: at a first client, determining a first version identifier associated with a first version of a business application used by the first client to perform a business process; at the first client, determining a

Art Unit: 3621

second version identifier associated with a second version of the business application used by a second client to perform the business process (see., abstract, col 4, lines 41-67, col 5, lines 1-7.

Applicant should duly note that a first version of a business application is the process of enabling an author to create and store an original document or first document or first application, and the first client and the second client see., fig 1, and also the second version application is the process of updating and retrieve information as files or file-converter and then published in any specific format to multiple numbers of and type of receiving appliances).

It is to be noted that Guck fails to explicitly disclose that if the first version is higher that the second version, to exercise control over execution of the business process, and if the second version is higher that the first version to control the execution of the process (which is readable as if the first user protocol is higher than the second user protocol then exercise control over the business process and vice versa, or the first user who process the first request will have control over the business process). Applicant should duly note that a user with a faster protocol, should have control over the business process.

However, Slaughter discloses a cluster distribution in which each node of the cluster access to each storage device of the cluster using a faster protocol such as Low Latency (see., col 10, lines 8-15). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the format conversion of Guck by including a faster protocol as taught by Slaughter because such modification would provide the format conversion of Guck with the enhanced necessary to have a faster network communication or business process.

Art Unit: 3621

As per claims 23 and 24 Guck discloses the claimed limitations, wherein generate a first business message associated with the business process for communication from the first client to the second client, the first business message being generated according to the second version; and retrieve from the second client a second business message generated by the second client according to the second version (see., abstract, col 4, lines 41-67, col 5, lines 1-7. Applicant should duly note that a first version of a business application is the process of enabling an author to create, update and store an original document or first document or first application, which is automatically reformatted to match the requirements of the receiver's appliance, and the first client and the second client see., fig 1, and also the second version application is the process of updating and retrieve information as files or file-converter and then published in any specific format to multiple numbers of and type of receiving appliances).

REMARKS

5. In response to Applicant's argument filed on 08/14/2003, Applicant argues that the Examiner must give proper weight and meaning to Applicant's recited first and second versions of the single business application and the recited first and second versions of the single business application perform. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees, as those limitations are explicitly recited in the previous Office action, specifically in the Office action mailed on 07/22/2003, see., abstract, col 4, lines 41-67, col 5, lines 1-7. **Applicant should duly note that a first version of a business application is the process of enabling an author to create and store an original document or**

Art Unit: 3621

first document or first application, and the first client and the second client see., fig 1, and also the second version application is the process of updating and retrieve information as files or file-converter and then published in any specific format to multiple numbers of and type of receiving appliances).

b. Applicant argues that neither Guck nor Slaughter taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest” if the first version is higher that the second version, to exercise control over execution of the business process, and if the second version is higher that the first version to control the execution of the process” (which is readable as if the first user protocol is higher than the second user protocol then exercise control over the business process and vice versa, or the first user who process the first request will have control over the business process). Applicant should duly note that a user with a faster protocol, should have control over the business process.

However, as mentioned in the previous Office actions mailed on 10/3/2002, 02/24/2003, and 07/22/2003, Slaughter discloses a cluster distribution in which each node of the cluster access to each storage device of the cluster using a faster protocol such as Low Latency (see., col 10, lines 8-15). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the format conversion of Guck by including a faster protocol as taught by Slaughter because such modification would provide the format conversion of Guck with the enhanced necessary to have a faster network communication or business process. Therefore, Applicant’s argument is moot.

Art Unit: 3621

c. Applicant also argues that the Examiner again **appears** to equate first and second user protocols with Applicant's recited first and second versions of the single business. As stated above, the first version of a business application is the process of enabling an author to create and store an original document or first document or first application, and the first client and the second client see., fig 1, and also the second version application is the process of updating and retrieve information as files or file-converter and then published in any specific format to multiple numbers of and type of receiving appliances).

CONCLUSION

6. The prior art made of record and relied upon is considered to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Pierre Eddy Elisca at (703) 305-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday from 5:30AM. to 6:00PM.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

The Official Fax Number For TC 3600 is:

(703) 305-7687

Application/Control Number: 09/415,052

Page 9

Art Unit: 3621


Pierre Eddy Elisca

Patent Examiner

October 27, 2003